

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action a suggested amendment to the Title was made, and that suggestion has been adopted herein. Also, it was pointed out that reference designation C4 in Fig. 13 was not mentioned in the Specification, and that the Abstract needed revision. Both of these objections have been overcome in the foregoing Amendment.

Next, it is acknowledged that Claims 6 and 11 were objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to relate the claimed program limitations to a computer-readable storage medium. That issue is also overcome in the foregoing Amendment. Another rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102 was directed to Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12. As a result of the Amendments, however, it is clear that those claims are not directed to mere abstract ideas. Instead, those claims specify the mutual relations of the physical constitution of the invention and state in Claims 1 and 12 that a panoramic image is read from a storage unit in the reading step. Also, Claim 7 (and new Claim 13) clarify that an actually taken image is read from a storage unit which stores plural actually taken images respectively being made correspondent to a map, and the read actually taken image is displayed.

Referring now to the rejections based on the cited prior art, Applicants note that the main characteristics of the invention, as set forth in Claims 1, 6 and 12 concern the concrete processes of calculating the annotation display location, that is, “calculating relative coordinates of an annotation object with respect to the route to which the view position corresponds (S104 in Fig. 7)” and “calculating a display position of said annotation object based on the viewpoint position and the relative coordinates of said annotation object (S105 in Fig. 7)”. As for the cited Kurogi reference, it is disclosed, in the section 2 thereof, that annotations are previously added to plural panorama images, and an annotation is added to the video frame of a view point based

on the annotation in the panorama image nearest to the view point, but the Kourogi reference does not disclose the main characteristics of Applicants' Claims 1, 6, and 12, as referred to above. Similarly, those characteristics are not disclosed in other cited references to Jongerius; Oura; Harmon; and Pang et al.

Accordingly, it is believed that the invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 6 and 12 is patentably distinct over the Kourogi et al., Jongerius, Oura, Harmon, Pang et al. references, and over any possible combination thereof.

As for the requirements of amended independent Claims 7 and 11 and new independent Claim 13, the present invention is characterized in that an annotation display position is set based on a manual instruction with respect to a representative actually taken image, and an annotation display position is automatically set through the calculation based on the set result with respect to another actually taken image. More specifically, the invention of those claims is characterized as "setting the annotation display position in the displayed actually taken image based on the manual instruction" and "calculating an annotation display position of another actually taken image located between the plural actually taken images to which the annotation display positions have been set respectively, based on the annotation display positions respectively set in the plural actually taken images". Accordingly, in the present invention, the annotation display position of another actually taken image is acquired by the calculation based on the annotation display position of the plural actually taken images sandwiching another actually taken image. Thus, it is possible in the present invention to set the annotation display position with high accuracy as compared with the Kourogi reference which uses the annotation information at the nearest panorama image. Moreover, these characteristics and their stated

effect are not disclosed in other references either, wherefore it is believed that the invention as stated in independent Claims 7, 11 and 13 is patentably distinct over the cited prior art.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 596247v1